



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/527,328	09/22/2005	Koji Okomori	159-87	3539
23117	7590	01/02/2009	EXAMINER	
NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC 901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR ARLINGTON, VA 22203			SHEWAREGED, BETELHEM	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1794	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/02/2009	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/527,328	OKOMORI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Betelhem Shewareged	1794	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 October 2008.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 6 and 8 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 6 and 8 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

## DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's response filed on 10/15/2008 has been fully considered. The Claim Objection has been withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendment. Claims 6 and 8 are amended, claim 1-5, 7 and 9 are canceled, and claims 6 and 8 are pending.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kai et al. (JP 2002-088679) in view of Matsumura et al. (JP 2002-161494), Ryu et al. (US 2001-288690) and Shay et al. (US 5,478,602).

4. Claim 6: Kai teaches a coated paper for gravure printing provides a coated layer having pigment and an adhesive on a base paper. The coated paper for gravure printing is characterized by providing a coated layer containing 50 parts by weight or more (based on 100 parts by weight pigment) of kaolin as the pigment, having particle diameter distribution contained in an amount of  $\geq 65\%$  in a range of 0.4-4.2  $\mu\text{m}$  based on volume (abstract). Kai further teaches that an organic pigment may be contained in the coating composition [0014]. Kai does not teach a hollow pigment as the organic pigment.

5. Matsumura teaches a gravure printing paper containing a paper and a coating layer containing a hollow organic pigment provided on the paper (abstract). The hollow pigment has a particle size of 0.2-0.5 um [0011], and is contained in an amount of 5-20 parts by weight [0016].

6. Kai and Matsumura are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor that is the gravure coated paper art. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the hollow organic pigment of Matsumura with the invention of Kai, and the motivation would be, as Matsumura suggests, to improve the glossiness property of the layer, provide precise coating and improve drying property of the layer [0012].

7. In one example, Kai teaches coating the base paper at a coating speed of 500m/min, and the invention of Kai is not limited to one example. However, Shay teaches a coated paper for gravure printing, wherein the coating is provided at a coating speed of 4000ft/min [1219m/min] (col. 14, line 40).

8. Kai and Shay are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor that is the coated paper art. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to apply the coating at a higher coating speed, and the motivation would be, as Shay suggests, to reduce the water forced into the substrate (col. 13, lines 24-25), and to increase production of the coated paper without damaging.

9. In the examples of Kai, sheet gloss and density have been taught (see Table 2); however, the invention of Kai is not limited to the examples. The Office realizes that all

of the claimed effects or physical properties are not positively stated by the reference(s). However, the reference(s) teaches all of the claimed ingredients. Therefore, the claimed effects and physical properties, i.e. a sheet gloss and density would implicitly be achieved by a composite with all the claimed ingredients. If it is the applicant's position that this would not be the case: (1) evidence would need to be provided to support the applicant's position; and (2) it would be the Office's position that the application contains inadequate disclosure that there is no teaching as to how to obtain the claimed properties with only the claimed ingredients.

10. Claim 8: Kai does not teach the base paper contains amorous silicate in an amount of 3-12% by weight. However, Ryu teaches a paper containing silicate [0010] in an amount of 3 or less weight % [0011], wherein the amount over laps with the claimed value of 3-12%. Kai and Ryu are analogous art because they are from similar problem solving area in relation to base paper. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the silicate of Ryu with the invention of Kai, and the motivation would be, as Ryu suggests, controlling coefficient of friction and printing opacity of the paper [0011].

11. Claims 6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kai et al. (JP 2002-088679) in view of Sasaki et al. (JP 11-279990), Ryu et al. (US 2001-288690) and Shay et al. (US 5,478,602).

12. Claim 6: Kai teaches a coated paper for gravure printing provides a coated layer having pigment and an adhesive on a base paper. The coated paper for gravure printing

is characterized by providing a coated layer containing 50 parts by weight or more (based on 100 parts by weight pigment) of kaolin as the pigment, having particle diameter distribution contained in an amount of  $\geq 65\%$  in a range of 0.4-4.2  $\mu\text{m}$  based on volume (abstract). Kai further teaches that an organic pigment may be contained in the coating composition [0014]. Kai does not teach a hollow pigment as the organic pigment.

13. Sasaki teaches a gravure printing paper containing a paper and a coating layer having a hollow organic pigment provided on the paper (abstract), wherein the hollow pigment has a particle size of 0.4-2.0  $\mu\text{m}$  [0016], in amount of 3-15% by weight [0014].

14. Kai and Sasaki are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor that is the gravure coated paper art. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the hollow organic pigment of Sasaki with the invention Kai, and the motivation would be, to enhance the ink receiving property of the layer.

15. In one example, Kai teaches coating the base paper at a coating speed of 500m/min, and the invention of Kai is not limited to one example. However, Shay teaches a coated paper for gravure printing, wherein the coating is provided at a coating speed of 4000ft/min [1219m/min] (col. 14, line 40).

16. Kai and Shay are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor that is the coated paper art. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to apply the coating at a higher coating speed, and the motivation would be, as Shay suggests, to reduce the water forced into

the substrate (col. 13, lines 24-25), and to increase production of the coated paper without damaging.

17. In the examples of Kai, sheet gloss and density have been taught (see Table 2); however, the invention of Kai is not limited to the examples. The Office realizes that all of the claimed effects or physical properties are not positively stated by the reference(s). However, the reference(s) teaches all of the claimed ingredients. Therefore, the claimed effects and physical properties, i.e. a sheet gloss and density would implicitly be achieved by a composite with all the claimed ingredients. If it is the applicant's position that this would not be the case: (1) evidence would need to be provided to support the applicant's position; and (2) it would be the Office's position that the application contains inadequate disclosure that there is no teaching as to how to obtain the claimed properties with only the claimed ingredients.

18. Claim 8: Kai does not teach the base paper contains amorous silicate in an amount of 3-12% by weight. However, Ryu teaches a paper containing silicate [0010] in an amount of 3 or less weight % [0011], wherein the amount over laps with the claimed value of 3-12%. Kai and Ryu are analogous art because they are from similar problem solving area in relation to base paper. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the silicate of Ryu with the invention of Kai, and the motivation would be, as Ryu suggests, controlling coefficient of friction and printing opacity of the paper [0011].

19. Claims 6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kai et al. (JP 2002-088679) in view of Hayashi et al. (JP 06-235194), Ryu et al. (US 2001-288690) and Shay et al. (US 5,478,602).

20. Claim 6: Kai teaches a coated paper for gravure printing provides a coated layer having pigment and an adhesive on a base paper. The coated paper for gravure printing is characterized by providing a coated layer containing 50 parts by weight or more (based on 100 parts by weight pigment) of kaolin as the pigment, having particle diameter distribution contained in an amount of  $\geq 65\%$  in a range of 0.4-4.2  $\mu\text{m}$  based on volume (abstract). Kai further teaches that an organic pigment may be contained in the coating composition [0014]. Kai does not teach a hollow pigment as the organic pigment.

21. Hayashi teaches a gravure printing paper containing a paper and a coating layer containing a hollow organic pigment provided on the paper (abstract), wherein the hollow pigment has a particle size of 0.5-3.0  $\mu\text{m}$  in an amount of 2-30 parts by weight [0004].

22. Kai and Hayashi are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor that is the gravure coated paper art. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the hollow organic pigment of Hayashi with the invention of Kai, and the motivation would be to enhance the printing property and glossiness of the layer.

23. In one example, Kai teaches coating the base paper at a coating speed of 500m/min, and the invention of Kai is not limited to one example. However, Shay

teaches a coated paper for gravure printing, wherein the coating is provided at a coating speed of 4000ft/min [1219m/min] (col. 14, line 40).

24. Kai and Shay are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor that is the coated paper art. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to apply the coating at a higher coating speed, and the motivation would be, as Shay suggests, to reduce the water forced into the substrate (col. 13, lines 24-25), and to increase production of the coated paper without damaging.

25. In the examples of Kai, sheet gloss and density have been taught (see Table 2); however, the invention of Kai is not limited to the examples. The Office realizes that all of the claimed effects or physical properties are not positively stated by the reference(s). However, the reference(s) teaches all of the claimed ingredients. Therefore, the claimed effects and physical properties, i.e. a sheet gloss and density would implicitly be achieved by a composite with all the claimed ingredients. If it is the applicant's position that this would not be the case: (1) evidence would need to be provided to support the applicant's position; and (2) it would be the Office's position that the application contains inadequate disclosure that there is no teaching as to how to obtain the claimed properties with only the claimed ingredients.

26. Claim 8: Kai does not teach the base paper contains amorous silicate in an amount of 3-12% by weight. However, Ryu teaches a paper containing silicate [0010] in an amount of 3 or less weight % [0011], wherein the amount over laps with the claimed value of 3-12%. Kai and Ryu are analogous art because they are from similar problem

solving area in relation to base paper. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the silicate of Ryu with the invention of Kai, and the motivation would be, as Ryu suggests, controlling coefficient of friction and printing opacity of the paper [0011].

### ***Response to Arguments***

27. Applicant's argument is based on that Kai and Matsumura do not teach the claimed density. This argument is not persuasive for the following reason. In the examples of Kai, sheet gloss and density have been taught (see Table 2); however, the invention of Kai is not limited to the examples. The sheet gloss and density would implicitly be achieved by a composite with all the claimed ingredients. Matsumura is used to teach the claimed hollow organic pigment; Matsumura is not used to teach the sheet gloss and density.

28. Applicant further argued that Ryu does not teach the claimed sheet gloss, and it is inappropriate to combine Kai and Ryu. These arguments are not persuasive for the following reasons. Ryu is used to teach the claimed amorphous silicate; Ryu is not used to teach the sheet gloss and density. Furthermore, Examiner shows above that Kai and Ryu are from similar problem solving area, in which case Kai and Ryu do not have to be from the same field of endeavor. Similar problem solving area considers how inventions or their components are viewed apart from the Applicant's field of endeavor. An Examiner can view the modifying of a reference as the solving of a

problem. The problem equals the difference between the base reference and the claim. In this case the problem is the amorphous silicate.

29. Applicant also argued that the Shay does not teach the claimed sheet gloss and density. The argument is not persuasive for the following reason. Shay is used to teach the claimed coating speed; Shay is not used to teach the sheet gloss and density.

30. For the above reason claims 6 and 8 stand rejected.

### ***Conclusion***

31. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

32. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

33. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Betelhem Shewareged whose telephone number is (571)272-1529. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9am-5pm.

34. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano can be reached on 571-272-1398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

35. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

BS  
December 31, 2008.

/Betelhem Shewareged/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794